

REMARKS**Pending Claims**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 18 and 20-24 are pending. No amendment is made to the claims herein, except to cancel claim 19.

Claim Objections

The Applicant has amended claim 24 to address the paragraph numbering error noted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected as being indefinite because the phrase “said database...” lacks antecedent basis. The Applicant respectfully notes that claim 18, from which claims 20 and 21 depend recites in element b a “database”, and therefore the Applicant believes the recitation of “said database” in claims 20 and 21 is proper.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 18 and 20-24 are rejected as being anticipated by Atsmon. The Applicant respectfully submits that elements recited in claims 18 and 20-24 are not described in (or suggested by) Atsmon. Specifically, claims 18 and 20-24 recite a system that is deployed in a retail store setting and allows a user to approach a kiosk in the retail store setting, present a user identifier and then be logged into their preferred portal. In this manner, the user can experience the internet in the same manner they’re accustomed to experiencing it on their own computer, i.e. seeing their preferred home page with all its many previously selected user-specified preferences and content choices. Claims 18 and 20-24 recite elements that yield this kiosk experience. For example, in claim 18:

- e) kiosk in the retail store for displaying the internet for the user to view and use;
- f) means, coupled to the kiosk, for accessing the user’s preferred portal and login data from said database and for logging the user into the preferred portal, upon presentment of the physical embodiment of the user identifier to said reader device.

Claims 20-23 depend from claim 18 and therefore also include these features. An analogous recitation appears in independent claim 24.

Atsmon, in contrast, entirely fails to disclose or suggest or recognize a need for a user identifier that is associated with stored information about the user’s web portal preference. Atsmon does describe an electronic card that is sued with a personal computer. “For example, the user could use the electronic card to interact with a web merchant 17 and a web portal 18 via the Internet 16.” Col. 9, lines 1-4. And Atsmon

describes many of the functions that could be performed with Atsmon's electronic card may include "at one extreme [of complexity] the simple task of providing information to a web merchant or store (i.e., "I am present.") to a medium complexity task of automating the process of filling out a form and, at the other extreme, performing a complicated series of tasks involving security, context sensitivity actions, and multiple modes." Col. 9, lines 40-47. Atsmon does not, however, describe using the card to allow a user to access their previously-specified web portal and automatically log them in to that portal so that their user experience at a computer in a public place matches what they're accustomed to.

It is noted that at column 91, lines 49 et seq, Atsmon describes that a card may take you to a url predefined by the card issuer or merchant. This, however, is not the same as taking the user to a web portal of the user's choice, that has been previously selected by the user, and logging them in based on their previously stored login information, as recited in Applicant's claims. Applicant notes that at column 92, lines 15 et seq Atsmon lists the information stored in conjunction with the user account (i.e. "name, shipping address, billing address, credit card number, expiration date, and digital ID"). This list does not include preferred portal or portal login information. Further, the Atsmon system anticipates that Atsmon's card will be used in a user's home to access a specific merchant's web site or web store to execute an online purchase. Applicant's system provides essentially the opposite: it services a customer in a store who wants to view the internet from their preferred portal, just as they would from home.


Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Atsmon does not show or disclose a system incorporating all the features recited in claims 18 and 20-24.

CONCLUSION

All of the claims remaining in this application should now be seen to be in condition for allowance. The prompt issuance of a notice to that effect is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
BEST BUY COMPANY, INC.
By its attorneys:

Date: 6/23/08



Stephanie J. James
Registration No. 34,437
Beck & Tysver, P.L.L.C.
2900 Thomas Ave., #100
Minneapolis, MN 55416
Telephone: (612) 915-9636
Fax: (612) 915-9637